Introduction

"Ex Pluribus Plures": Cultural Histories in the Twenty-First Century

A culture roiled with radical changes, a history of greatness and of misery, a society of rifts and restorations – this is Poland, then and now. During the sixteenth century it was the third-mightiest power in Europe; in the seventeenth, it had repelled the Ottoman Invasion of the Old World; and in the eighteenth, it had created Europe's first national constitution – while on the brink of losing its independence. Non-existent as a state throughout the nineteenth century, it was revived at the end of the First World War for a mere two decades and then vanished from the map once again with the onset of the Second World War. A Soviet satellite thereafter, it became a sovereign country – at last – only fifty years later, in 1989. Since then, Poland has been once again injecting its tumultuous legacy and creative potential into the global narrative. This book is part of that process.

This is by no means the first history of Polish literature and culture intended for an English-speaking audience. It has some illustrious predecessors, starting with Manfred Kridl's *A Survey of Polish Literature and Culture* (1956), through *The History of Polish Literature* (1969) by the Nobel Prize–winning poet Czesław Miłosz, and ending with Julian Krzyżanowski's *A History of Polish Literature* (1978). The first two authors taught at American universities and wrote their textbooks with that readership in mind; the third taught briefly in London, but his book was a translation of a Polish text written for Polish university students, whose background made them receptive to the material. All three authors presented Polish literature from its medieval beginnings to various points in the twentieth century: Kridl up to 1918, Krzyżanowski up to 1939, and Miłosz – if the brief epilogue added to the second (1983) edition of his *History* is taken into account – up to 1980.

The present work focuses on modern and postmodern developments in Polish culture, targeting periods that previous volumes either could not address or addressed only briefly. It begins with the end of the First World War, a war that many see as the true beginning of the twentieth century and that, for Poland, marked a return to independence after 123 years of partition. It closes with the most recent developments, which warrant a place in this book despite the uncertainty of their future cultural standing. This trajectory reflects a crucial assumption of this project – that what is happening in Polish culture as this book goes to press is just as relevant as what has been historically validated as canonical. Such a view is rare in most traditional literary histories, as exemplified by the above-mentioned works of Kridl, Miłosz, and Krzyżanowski.

The histories written before this one were also monological; Miłosz's book in particular was a personal and at times even biased account.[1] This book embraces a different model of authorship: it offers a polyphonic model of cultural analysis by engaging close to sixty scholars from Europe and North America. In so doing, it capitalizes on their

multiple intellectual, cultural, generational, and institutional perspectives, as well as a variety of theoretical tools and approaches. Our contributors illuminate the paradoxes, contradictions, and occasional inscrutability of Poland's modern and contemporary cultural practices, appealing equally to anglophone scholars, students, and generalist readers interested in Polish and world cultural history.

This internationalization of authorship defies – as it did in *A New History of French Literature* (1989) and *A New History of German Literature* (2004) – the old belief that "literary history has to be written by natives, from within."[2] This view is outdated for many reasons. Over the past century, the accelerating interconnectivity of the globalizing world has changed the modes of both the production and reception of culture and the nature of knowledge. It has reconfigured intellectual communities, including their means of communication and what they can offer one another. The transatlantic distribution of our contributors is a good example of such reconfiguration. In today's multicontextual world, hegemonic interpretations and clearly delineated subjects of inquiry are downplayed, and the territory of academic expertise and ownership is being radically remapped. This is not to say that these global tendencies have discredited the importance of local traditions or the expertise fostered by specific local environments. In our view, the purpose of international academic collaboration is to capitalize on the strengths of such traditions and contexts and on what transpires from their multifocality, while also drawing in new readers, with their multiple interests, frames of reference, and modes of communication. The comparative, interdisciplinary, transcultural approach is as much a way of writing here as it is a way of reading.

The new cultural histories, with their collaborative approach, expect to attract new readers. In the French and German cases, the authors undoubtedly benefited from the centrality of these cultures in the world reception of European history. The Polish case is different in this regard due to its specific history: for two centuries, it was empires that spoke for a non-sovereign and at times non-existent Poland. Its own historical and cultural meta-narratives were outside the mainstream narratives of Western Europe at the time when European nationalisms took centre stage. This process of becoming Europe's "Other" – its silent backwater periphery – only intensified during the Cold War, further entrenching a division first established two centuries previously, as Larry Woolf points out in *Inventing Eastern Europe*.[3] After the Iron Curtain was raised, this sweeping notion of Eastern Europe became naturalized for the broader Western audience.

Moreover, local (Polish) traditions and external (European) influences intertwined with exceptional intensity at times, generating eccentric cultural formations such as Polish Sarmatism (seventeenth century) and Romanticism (nineteenth century). Both these formations are still important in contemporary Polish culture even while remaining at odds with their Western counterparts; both are difficult to understand for students grounded in more dominant and better-known European traditions. The reasons for their idiosyncrasies are culturally and historically specific. Sarmatism dominated Polish culture at a time when Poland was still one of Europe's great powers, and its peculiarities vis-à-vis Western Europe were not viewed as cause for an inferiority complex; on the contrary, Sarmatism was a source of pride for Poles.

Polish culture also appears unique when examined in the context of nineteenth-century modernity. Along with the rest of Europe, Poland participated in two processes of modernity: modernism, which emancipated the individual in all spheres of social and creative life, and modernization, with its advances in commercial, scientific, and technological

infrastructures. In the case of Poland (and of other suppressed cultures, such as Czech, Greek, Italian, and Irish), however, the relationship between modernism and modernization translated into especially pronounced tensions between traditionalism and innovation. Poland's national culture felt a relentless pressure to resist colonization by sustaining tradition as the unwavering foundation of collective identity, while at the same time responding to the modern imperative to innovate. In other words, it faced an inherently contradictory demand: to hold on to the past while embracing the future. Furthermore, having been partitioned between three empires, Poland underwent three separate and indeed conflicting processes of modernization, all the while remaining on the margins of the partitioning powers, which were not particularly interested in coordinating the modernization of their colonized provinces. As a result, the Polish version of modernity was inconsistent with the hegemonic European model.

Mapping the Volume

Readers would do well not to rush through this book. It does not have to be read in its entirety, nor does it need to be read in sequence. The approach can be random, with the reader acting like a contemporary *flâneur* on a journey that is open to chance, sensitive to detail, and aimed at discovering not the whole of the "city" but its individual fragments, with all that they entail. Alternatively, one could plan their journey through this book more systematically, using its contents pages and introduction as a guide. In this case, the readers' decisions would follow from their interests and needs. There is yet another way to explore the modern and postmodern Polish culture as presented here, namely by means of associations and in line with the proposal put forth by Jorge Luis Borges in "The Garden of Forking Paths." His short story corresponds well with the underlying structure of this book, which makes possible the passage from a text that speaks of ties between Polish interwar prose and reportage, for instance, to one solely dedicated to the latter, and from there to an essay about Polish film, which in turn could lead to a text about a chosen film director. Indeed, to make the most out of this garden, one may have to become lost in it at least once.

This *History* adopts four intertwining frameworks to allow readers different points of entry into their explorations of Polish culture. The first three parts, under the respective headings of Transitions, Strategies, and Transmissions, complicate historical and typological narratives of traditional histories of literature and culture by foregrounding coordinates that have organized Polish cultural imagination for centuries. Part I, "Transitions," engages with the already mentioned paradigms of Sarmatism and Romanticism, whose various replications and contestations speak to their ongoing meta-narrative vitality in Polish culture. Sarmatism, which took root and flourished in the Commonwealth of Both Nations during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, had no equivalent among Western European cultures of that time. It impacted the political system, lifestyle, literature, and material culture of the gentry in the Commonwealth until the eighteenth century. With the nineteenth century came Polish Romanticism, which decisively shaped Polish national identity. A slightly belated peer of European Romanticism, it emerged in an already partitioned Poland and acquired its idiosyncratic character particularly after the November Uprising of 1830–1.

These two somewhat clashing paradigms have channelled much of Polish intellectual life, beginning with the self-questionings of the Romantics themselves and continuing

throughout the twentieth century. Polish modernism, for example, would undoubtedly have a different face if Witold Gombrowicz (its main international representative today) had not duelled with both Polish Sarmatism and Romanticism. To give a collectively resonant example, the internationally known and often celebrated phenomenon of civil dissent in Poland had its main features modelled by both of these paradigms.[4] Such examples can be multiplied, and their pervasive cultural presence partly explains the urgency of Polish culture's search for equally strong counter-narratives and its repeated attempts to find new ways of inhabiting the realities of Poland's post-1989 cultural space and identity. Thus, contemporary reimaginings of Poland's lost multi-ethnic culture have new multicultural, globalizing, and transnational discourses as their context, while returns to historical moments of monumental loss find, in their most successful incarnations, a common framework for discussing national particularities.

The six essays of Part I are paired to provide twofold reinterpretations of Sarmatism, Romanticism, and Modernism, respectively. Written by the scholars on both sides of the Atlantic, they explore the intellectual history of these paradigms and make opposing claims about their significance, permutations, and influence. They access Polish modern and contemporary culture through its internal tensions, paradoxes, and contradictions, scrutinizing the factors that have delineated its contours over the centuries. The cultural and historical complexities of Sarmatism are re-examined via a political and socio-economic critique in one essay (Jan Sowa), and from a philosophical and cultural perspective in the other (Ewa Thompson), with these two approaches leading their authors to diametrically opposed conclusions. In the first essay devoted to Romanticism, in turn, Stanley Bill analyses the reception and long-term impact of Romanticism in its diverse modes of popular transmission, while Dariusz Skórczewski's discussion utilizes a postcolonial perspective to reassess both well-known and overlooked aspects of the Romantic paradigm over its long duration in Polish intellectual history. Indeed, the comparative potential of all four essays becomes apparent both in their discussions of local specificities within the broad, European cultural context and in their oppositional relations to one another.

The two essays on modernism build an understanding of what modern and postmodern formations mean in the Polish context. Włodzimierz Bolecki argues for the existence of a specific Eastern European modernism and outlines the modalities and historical specificities of its Polish incarnation. He also analyses the continuities and discontinuities of this Eastern European development vis-à-vis its broader European modernist framework. The second essay by Ryszard Nycz proposes a new typology of Polish literature of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries and formulates four general models of literature by adopting the oppositional notions of the elite and the popular as well as the autonomous and the engaged. Both essays provide a strong historical and theoretical backbone for the systematic discussion of individual genres that constitutes Part IV (Genres and Their Discontents) of the volume.

The second framework of "Strategies," presented in Part II, reconfigures Polish culture from another perspective by proposing four distinct modes of its interpretation: canonical, emancipatory, transgressive, and compensatory. These culturally adapted strategies of engaging with dominant cultural norms and practices serve here as interpretative frameworks for addressing overarching questions about Polish culture and its particularities over the past two centuries. Each strategy uses different means, sets different goals, and performs different functions in relation to these leading cultural paradigms. In engaging with these norms and practices as well as with one another, they form conceptual

networks that allow the marginal, the excluded, the suppressed, the silenced, and the "forgotten" to assert their individual positions within or against the mainstream. They also reference and build on arguments raised in Part I regarding the Sarmatian, Romantic, and Modernist paradigms, as well as foreshadow issues of gender, ethnicity, language, trauma, and cultural identity that arise throughout the essays of Part IV.

The first – *canonical* – strategy is a clear point of reference for the other three. It validates the norm but also hides the mechanisms of its creation, thus naturalizing it as a norm. Its function is to stabilize cultural practices while serving as a tool for assessing such stability. The *emancipatory* strategy, in turn, is invested in overcoming old norms and replacing them with new ones, positing its function as liberating and socially progressive. It pushes against everything that is seen as restricting the subject's sovereignty. The *compensatory* strategy, by contrast, focuses on the culture's reading of the canonical. Its goal is to therapeutically (mis)read the canon for the sake of the long-term cultural sustenance of its practitioners, however this sustenance is understood. It separates out the canon's otherness – precisely what the *transgressive* approach privileges – in order to build collective and redemptive narratives; it is based on the replication of sameness and is thus repetitive and compulsive. Transgression challenges the boundaries of the norm without disinheriting or destroying it. The *transgressive* strategy sheds light on the laws that constitute the canon and implicates them in what is transgressed. It also seeks out the hidden places, gaps, fissures, and ruptures that allow chaos through, even if only momentarily. In its function, therefore, the transgressive is anarchic and epiphanic.

The four essays in Part II present different approaches to their respective strategies. Thus, Bożena Shallcross's essay on the canonical proposes a concept of the transatlantic canon – namely, the canon of Polish literature existing outside of Poland – and probes the mechanism of its creation in North America through the production of literary translations and histories available in English. Grażyna Borkowska's essay on emancipation chronologically traces the emancipatory gestures and narratives in Polish prose that attest to the insufficiency and limits of the domestic canon. Joanna Niżyńska's essay on compensation reads Polish cultural responses to the twentieth century's historical traumas, particularly the Second World War, and analyses the paradoxical mechanisms of cultural affective compensation whereby the traumatic is reproduced rather than worked through. Finally, focusing on the idea of sacrifice, Tamara Trojanowska's essay on transgression scrutinizes the intersections between what is individual, personal, and intimate and what is culturally and historically scandalous in the context of twentieth-century Polish theatre projects.

The third framework of "Transmissions," presented in Part III, expands the notion of literary and cultural history further still. It responds to one of the challenges facing national literary histories, as identified already in the 1990s by Linda Hutcheon and Mario Valdès, namely the risk of "marginalizing or even excluding the literary creations of ... those working ... in other languages or other cultural traditions."[5] It also underscores the need for a more flexible and integrative concept of literary history than that implied by a focus on a single language, which is often conceived as a synecdoche of a nation: besides accounting for the obvious fact that people can and often do participate in several language communities at once, it addresses a point of particular significance to Polish studies abroad – that texts as well as ideas and images pass from one language to another through the medium of translation.

The five essays that constitute this part of the volume focus on the multilingual and multi-ethnic fabric of Polish culture, on the one hand, and on cultural transmissions on

the other, all the while highlighting their transatlantic perspective. Rafał Moczkodan's essay outlines the formative developments of exilic and diasporic Polish literature and culture. It discusses the most significant waves of exiles and emigrants during the last century, contextualizes their most important contributions to Polish domestic culture as well as to its internationalization, and outlines the impact of émigré cultural institutions on intellectual life in Poland and abroad. Beth Holmgren's discussion invites us to the Warsaw interwar cabaret and tells the exciting story of the extraordinarily fertile Polish-Jewish artistic collaboration. It focuses on Jewish writers of the cabaret songs, some of whom also happened to be exquisite poets, who wrote in Polish while self-consciously popularizing a notion of hybrid Polish-Jewish identity. The essay by Marta Skwara is devoted to the multilingual legacies of Polish culture and their rich history of violent disruptions, recent revivals, and transatlantic transmissions. It undercuts the notion of the homogeneity of Polish literature by charting the history of Poland's multilingual writings, starting with universal Latin, through modern bi- and multi-lingual writers, and ending with the transnational literature of the twenty-first century. The final two essays in Part III explore the multilingual aspects of Polish literature by focusing on translation. Tomasz Bilczewski outlines a history of translation as a model of transcultural osmosis in Polish culture, both domestic and exilic, and theorizes it in the context of historically configured Comparative Studies. Bill Johnston's discussion concerns the relationship between literary translation and cultural institutions, on the one hand, and cultural reception on the other. The questions posed by both authors probe the ways in which translation promotes a certain view of Central/Eastern European identity as well as the kind of "canon" it constructs for a Western audience.

The final part of the volume, "Genres and Their Discontents," recognizes that acts of interpretation are most often governed by generic conventions and assumptions. It is also fully aware, however, that the debate about the problematic status, if not the breakdown, of genres in literary histories is extensive and ongoing. Postmodernist criticism has undermined these assumptions many times while simultaneously recognizing that "it is the paradox of postmodern genre that the more radical the dissolution of traditional generic boundaries, the more important the concept of genericity becomes."[6] Using genres as a governing principle can restrict acts of interpretation, and the category of genre can determine the type of cultural production deemed worthy of institutional support. Nevertheless, building on a certain normative stability of aesthetic determinants and on genres' translatability into different cultural contexts has its benefits, particularly when bringing new literatures into dominant (in this case Western, Anglo-American, academic) contexts. It provides a stable point of reference for the essays that present alternative frameworks for discussing literature and culture in previous parts of the volume.

A historical account of literature must take into account the system of genre elements characteristic of a given time – its basic categories and diagnoses. In his memorable text about "blurred genres," Clifford Geertz drew in particular on the history of the modern European novel. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to conclude that it was the novel, thanks to the achievements of writers such as Flaubert, Proust, Dostoyevsky, and Conrad, that completely deregulated the genre system.[7] The situation was, and still is, somewhat different. In Europe, genres were the fundamental orientation system for literary histories for most of the twentieth century. To use Levi-Strauss's terms, this system was reminiscent of kinship in its ordering of relations. It allowed readers to situate a given work in

a diachronic perspective – for instance, by relating twentieth-century historical prose to the nineteenth-century historical novel. It also permitted a synchronic view of a specific text at a given moment of literature's development – for example, by comparing different approaches to the novel of manners. Differently put, the genre system made legible Harold Bloom's "anxiety of influence" and aided the discovery of tropes that pointed to a work's "murdered fathers" (the influential predecessors that its author was trying to surpass) and its "enemy brothers" (other artists who employed similar literary techniques).[8]

Genre typology has also played a significant role in the reception of Polish culture abroad and has become the most often encountered vehicle of Polish cultural identity. "Polish school of poetry," "Polish film school," and "Polish school of reportage" are all based on genre identification and go hand in hand with genre-dominated, often-taught books such as Czesław Miłosz's *Polish Postwar Poetry* (1965), Jan Kott's *Four Decades of Polish Essay* (1990), and the more recent collections *The Eagle and the Crow: Modern Polish Short Stories* (1996) and *Polish Cinema Now! Focus on Contemporary Polish Cinema* (2010).[9]

This volume builds on this familiar mode of reception and problematizes it by expanding the range of genres to include the essay (Michał Paweł Markowski), diary (Paweł Rodak), reportage (Zygmunt Ziątek), literary theory (Katarzyna Kasztenna), film (Elżbieta Ostrowska), mass media (Edwin Bendyk), popular culture (Marek Krajewski), and the graphic novel (Ewa Stańczyk) in addition to the more traditional categories of poetry (Piotr Śliwiński), prose (Jerzy Jarzębski; Przemysław Czapliński), and drama (Ewa Guderian-Czaplińska; Jerzy Kopciński). With such expansion comes a broadening of the contexts in which these genres are discussed. The reception of Polish literature abroad is one such context, highlighting the often unexpected success of genres that, until recently, received little institutionalized attention in Poland. This is the case with both essay and reportage, which hold a prominent place in this book.

This examination of genres also embraces issues that elsewhere might be addressed in separate thematic entries, such as otherness, ethnic minorities, and historical revisionism. In the Polish context these issues have often been tied to genre. For example, since 1989, prose has been the primary locus of the search for the lost heterogeneity of the Polish provinces (the so-called literature of small homelands), of the revival of interest in the multi-ethnic past of Poland's cities, and of the post-memorial reworking of collective identities. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, in turn, we observe an outburst of post-Holocaust works, mainly in film and drama. All of these issues have been present in Polish literature and culture for decades, recently reaching self-aware crystallizations in genre-specific waves.

The short essays about individual artists included in Part IV offer examples of concrete Polish realizations of different genres. They can also be read, however, in different configurations as sites of possible comparisons and extrapolations; some of these create expected connections, while others reveal surprising links. For instance, the authors of the texts on Bruno Schulz (Karen Underhill), Bolesław Leśmian (Benjamin Paloff), and Julian Przyboś (Bogdana Carpenter) foreground modernist visions of creation and representation that problematize the relationship between art, language, and reality. The essay on Schulz also resonates with Milija Gluhovic's essay on the theatre of Tadeusz Kantor and Artur Grabowski's on that of Sławomir Mrożek, with a common ground established by the pronounced cultural locality of these artists' works, all of which emerge from

the Central European imaginaries of Galicia. The focus on the condensed metaphysical dimension that comes up in the articles on Schulz and Leśmian is also at play in the essays of Kazimierz Braun on Juliusz Osterwa and of Allen J. Kuharski on Jerzy Grotowski, both of which discuss these artists' new concepts of theatre, and in Tadeusz Sobolewski's treatment of Krzysztof Kieślowski's films; taken together, all of these essays signal the continued importance of metaphysics in Polish culture.

Many contributors to this volume relate the subjects of their essays to the grand narrative of modernist metaphysics; for others, the national grand narratives (for instance, Romanticism) are the main points of reference. Such is the case in the essays on theatre director Leon Schiller (Ewa Guderian-Czaplińska), literary critic and novelist Karol Irzykowski (Kris van Hueckelom), film director Andrzej Wajda (Janina Falkowska), and novelist, playwright, and essayist Witold Gombrowicz (George Gasyna). Discussions of the novels of Stanisław Lem (Elżbieta Foeller-Pituch), the essay work of Jolanta Brach-Czaina (Eliza Szybowicz), Leszek Kołakowski (Maciej Michalski), and Czesław Miłosz (Marek Zaleski), and the reportage of Melchior Wańkowicz (Beata Nowacka), all provide occasions to explore the borders of literature and philosophy, as well as the hybridity and fluidity of genres. They can also be read through a different lens, for example in terms of the complexities of reception. One can add Ewa Mazierska's interpretation of Jerzy Skolimowski's films to this context for its engagement with the paradoxical dynamics of international and domestic reception. The essay on Brach-Czaina also resonates with Ursula Phillips' text on Zofia Nałkowska's novels, Katarzyna Taras' assessment of films by Wojciech Jerzy Has, and Krystyna Iłłakowicz's look at the film work of Dorota Kędzierzawska. In their specific ways, all of these essays address artists' commitment to existential and psychological investigations of often neglected subjects and experiences, whether they pertain to the aging body, sexuality, substance abuse, or the allusive emotions of children.

Daniel Gerould's discussions of Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz (Witkacy) and Stanisława Przybyszewska bring historiosophy into the picture. Paying careful attention to their artistic sensibilities, Gerould views revolutions as the kernel of their *Weltanschauung*. Historiosophy is a common framework for the discussion of many other artists in this volume, including Miłosz, Lem, Kantor, Leopold Buczkowski (Sławomir Buryła), and Tadeusz Różewicz (Andrzej Skrendo; Halina Filipowicz). Różewicz's investment in resuscitating the allegiance between language and experience is echoed in Artur Płaczkiewicz's reading of Miron Białoszewski's work and Andrea Lanoux's discussion of Anna Świrszczyńska, with both essays emphasizing the given poet's commitment to the deeply personal revalidation of the ordinary and the everyday. They point Polish literature away from grand narratives towards the underexplored territories of the individual, bodily experience of everyday reality (e.g., gender, aging) and the colloquial registers of language. These essays could just as well accompany the reader's experience of the already mentioned texts on Brach-Czaina and Kędzierzawska. Just as all of these artists discover a new agent in the overlooked and marginalized subject, the works of Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz (German Ritz), Olga Tokarczuk (Bożena Karwowska), Andrzej Stasiuk (Magdalena Marszałek), and Mariusz Szczygieł (Aleksander Kaczorowski and Przemysław Czapliński) are discussed in the context of new agency in the textual understanding of space. Such grouping points not only to their common framework of geopoetics but also to their generational trajectory from the historically rooted spatial imaginarium of Iwaszkiewicz to the mythical and imaginary explorations of the others.

As with every history of literature and culture in book form, this volume presents a snapshot of Polish culture at a particular moment in time. As such, it does not discuss many important forms of cultural production, for instance music, visual arts, and dance. Their significance in the history of Polish culture notwithstanding, for logistical reasons the scope of this volume is limited to the culture of the word. While other configurations of Polish literature and culture are easily conceivable, this volume's conceptualization emerged in response to the variety of needs encountered by its editors and contributors in their capacity as scholars and teachers. We trust that our readers will find it inspirational as they explore their own interests and forge new paths of thinking about Polish culture.

Tamara Trojanowska, Joanna Niżyńska,
and Przemysław Czapliński

NOTES

1 It is not surprising that Miłosz's history has become the most popular of the three. After all, he was a poet and essayist with an appealing writing style rather than a philologist bound to the prescriptive model of literary history, such as had taken root in nineteenth-century German academia and deeply impacted Polish scholarship.
2 Hollier, *A New History of French Literature*, xxi.
3 Woolf, *Inventing Eastern Europe*, 1–16.
4 Cf. Walicki, "The Three Traditions."
5 Hutcheon and Valdès, "Rethinking Literary History," 3–4.
6 Perloff, ed., *Postmodern Genres*, 4.
7 Geertz, "Blurred Genres," 165–79.
8 See Bloom, *Anxiety of Influence*, xi–xlvii.
9 Miłosz, *Polish Postwar Poetry*; Kott, *Four Decades of Polish Essay*; Halikowska and Hyde, eds., *The Eagle and the Crow*; Werner, ed., *Polish Cinema Now!*.

WORKS CITED

Bloom, Harold. *Anxiety of Influence. A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
Geertz, Clifford. "Blurred Genres. The Refiguration of Social Thought." *American Scholar* 49, no. 2 (Spring 1980): 165–79.
Halikowska, Teresa, and George Hyde, eds. *The Eagle and the Crow: Modern Polish Short Stories*. London and New York: Serpent's Tail, 1996.
Hollier, Denis, with R. Howard Bloch et al. *A New History of French Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.
Hutcheon, Linda, and Mario Valdès. "Rethinking Literary History – Comparatively." ACLS Occasional Paper 27 (1994).
Kott, Jan. *Four Decades of Polish Essays*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1990.
Miłosz, Czesław. *Polish Postwar Poetry*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1965; 3rd ed., Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
Perloff, Marjorie, ed. *Postmodern Genres*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989.

Walicki, Andrzej. "The Three Traditions in Polish Patriotism and Their Contemporary Relevance." In *Polish Paradoxes*. Edited by Stanisław Gomułka and Anthony Polonsky. 21–40. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Werner, Mateusz, ed. *Polish Cinema Now! Focus on Contemporary Polish Cinema*. London: John Libbey; Warsaw: Adam Mickiewicz Institute, 2010.

Woolf, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.